



iJRASET

International Journal For Research in
Applied Science and Engineering Technology



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH

IN APPLIED SCIENCE & ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

Volume: 7 Issue: XII Month of publication: December 2019

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2019.12160>

www.ijraset.com

Call:  08813907089

E-mail ID: ijraset@gmail.com

Scrutiny of Risks Factors in Construction Projects

Manoj Sharma¹, Dr. A. S.Trivedi², Neha Madhan³

¹Associate Professor, Civil IPS CTM Gwalior, RGPV University, Bhopal (M.P) / India

²Professor, Civil IPS CTM Gwalior, RGPV University, Bhopal (M.P) / India

³Research Scholar, M.Tech Civil IPS CTM Gwalior, RGPV University, Bhopal(M.P) / India

Abstract: *The construction industry is widely associated with a high risk and uncertainty due to the nature of its operating environment. This study aims to identify and evaluate key risk factors and their frequency and severity and then their impact in different types of construction projects in India.*

A questionnaire survey was conducted and a total of sixty five critical factors were identified and categorized into eight groups. These are: Financial related risk, Legal related risk, Management risk, Market related risk, Political and security related risk, Technical related risk, Environmental related risk, and Social related risk.. The results are presented on the basis of their frequency, severity and importance.

Keywords: *Risks, Project Risk Management, Relative important index, F.I.Index, S.I Index, I.I Index*

I. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this study is to conclude the prospect factors in industry, allotment of these factors, strategies used to traumatize risks and thus the techniques adopted in analysing these risks. the development project is exposed to a high degree of risk from the start of the project till the highest of the project.

Risk is printed as any event or prevalence which could have an impact on the action of project goals. Risk management in construction comes is to deal effectively with uncertainty and sudden events that might have an impact on palmy and timely completion of the project.

If risks don't seem to be known early throughout a project, it creates tons of exposure and uncertainties to the project life cycle, thereby touching such aspects as value, schedule and quality of the project. additionally, it'd additionally produce exposures within the space of Health, safety and surroundings.

Hence, risk management permits project managers to identify, analyze, respond and manage the risks of the project. this will be the rationale why risk management is extremely necessary for the palmy action for a project.

In drafting the contract, the getting strategy need to clearly outline the responsibilities of the consumer and therefore the contractor and such need to be specific and graspable. this will be to make positive that the prospect is clear for every the contractor and shopper thereby avoid future dispute.

The importance of risk management in construction comes are reportable by many authors. It had been completed that risk management is crucial to construction activities in minimizing losses and enhancing profitableness.

It had been explicit that risk management might be a way that need to be applied in associate trade to achieve the goals of the trade, thus it is necessary to unfold awareness and build interest amongst individuals to use risk management techniques within the trade. the prospect might be a measurable a neighborhood of uncertainty and is assumed as a deviation from the specified level, thus the prospect analysis is thus necessary for project choice and coordination of construction work.

II. OBJECTIVES

The main objectives of this study include the following:

- A. To identify the causes of risks in construction projects.
- B. To minimize the effect of risks in construction project..
- C. Ranking of the risk factors in accordance of their frequency, severity and importance.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

Table 1

Past	Title of Research
2010	Yasser Abdelghany, A.Samer Ezeidin- This paper focuses on the analysis of the different ICJV risk environments.
2011	Hong-bo Zhou, S.e. M.ASCE and Hui Zhang- This methodology has five main parts: modeling of BNs, determination of occurrence probabilities of risk events, assessment of consequences, calculations of risk value and membership degree of risk rating, and definitions of risk acceptance criteria.
2012	Hariharan Subramanyan, Priyadarshi H. Sawant and Vandana Bhatt - The risk response strategy suggested in this paper will be useful in mitigating the adverse effects of risk in project completion in the Indian construction industry.
2013	Muhammad Saiful Islam - The main attention was paid to the identification of different types of risk and rating the various risks arises in a project and assessing major risk factors. Besides, this research developed a risk management framework for proper management of Bangladeshi construction projects.
2015	Shahid Iqbal et al. - This study is based on findings of a questionnaire-based survey on risk management in construction projects in Pakistan, reporting the significance of different type of risk, ultimate responsibility for them and the effectiveness of some most common risk management techniques practiced in the industry
2016	Greeshma R Krishnan, Minu Anna Johny - Proper management of all these processes is quite challenging for the management team. Risk is nothing but the threats that occur during the project life cycle. Risk may be of various kinds. There are various factors which affects the occurrence of these risks.
2017	Paweł Szymański - The risk is present everywhere, in every area of life. One such area is the construction industry, where risk is ever-present element of a great puzzle. Effective risk management does not apply to the resignation of the risk, which is seemingly the cheapest option activity.
2018	Dr. Chaiwat Pooworakulchai –This article studied the main application to risk management in the construction industry by the sample texts document.
2019	Ahsan Nawaz et al.- Risk management is a comparatively new field and there is no core system of risk management in the construction industries of developing countries

IV. METHODOLOGY

A questionnaire survey was conducted by construction professionals representing various stakeholders involved in construction projects in India

A. Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire was designed based on critical factors were identified that contributed to the causes of risks. A questionnaire survey was developed to assess the perceptions of various construction professionals of the relative importance of causes and the effects of construction risks. The questionnaire was designed into two sections: Section A; section B. Section A is to obtain the requested background information about the respondents. Section B is to obtain information on the factors that contribute to the causes of risks in construction projects from the perspective of construction professionals. A total sixty seven resources related factors were identified under three broad categories, namely manpower related, material related and equipment related issues. The critical factors are listed in Table 1. A five point Likert scale (1 very low, 2 low, 3 moderate, 4 high, 5 very high) was adopted where respondents were asked to rank the importance and impact of a particular factor on risks in one of their selected projects. Descriptive statistical techniques, namely Relative Importance Index (RII) has been used to highlight the relative importance of critical factors as perceived by the respondents (Assaf et. al, 1995; Faridi and El-Sayegh, 2006; Iyer and Jha, 2005; kmaraswamy and Chan, 1998).

B. Analysis of Data

The data obtained was analyses to determine the relative importance of the various factors that contribute to causes of construction delays.

C. Relative Importance Index (RII)

Assess the relative significance among risks, previous literature work study suggests establishing a risk significance index by calculating a significance score for each risk. For Calculating the significance score, multiply the probability of occurrence by the degree of Impact. The significance score for each risk assessed by each respondent can be obtained through the model

$$S_j^i = A_j^i * B_j^i$$

Where S_{ij} = Significance score assessed by respondent j for risk i

A_{ij} = Occurrence of risk i, assessed by respondent j

B_{ij} = degree of impact of risk I, assessed by respondent j.

By averaging scores from every one of the reactions, it is conceivable to get a normal importance score for each hazard, and this normal score is known as the hazard record score and is utilized for positioning the dangers. The model for the figuring of hazard list score can be characterized as

$$R_s^i = \sum_j^T = 1 S_j^i / T$$

Where R_s^i = index score for risk i

S_j^i = Significance score assessed by respondent j for risk i

T= total number of responses

D. Design of the Survey

The respondents were requested to judge the total risk effect of each risk factor. The approach adopted is to consider two attributes for each risk: the probability level of the risk occurrence denoted by Frequency Index (F.I) and the degree of impact or the level of loss if the risk occurs denoted by Severity Index (S.I).By applying this approach, the respondents were asked to respond to the two attributes for each risk factor. For considering (F.I), the respondents were required to judge the probability level of risk occurrence by selecting one from among five levels, namely: Very small, Small, Normal, large, and Very Large. For considering (S.I) the respondents were asked to judge the degree of impact if the risk concerned occurs by selecting one from among five grades, namely: Very Low, Low, medium, High, and Very high.

E. Analysis Of Survey Results

To assess the relative significance among risks, previous literature study suggests establishing a risk significance index by calculating a significance score for each risk. For calculating the significance score is to multiply the probability of occurrence by the degree of impact. Thus, the significance score for each risk assessed by each respondent can be obtained

V. DATA ANALYSIS

Descriptive and frequency statistical analysis techniques were used to analyze the data collected in the survey. However, an advanced and accurate method is necessary to analyze the data in a systematic, fast and reliable way. For this purpose, the computer software Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS 16) and MS Excel were selected.

The data collected from the survey were analyzed using the frequency and severity index method (Assaf and Al-Hejji, 2006) [5]. Details of both frequency and severity index analysis are explained below.

According to Assaf and Al-Hejji (2006), a formula as shown in equation (1) was used to rank risk factors based on frequency of occurrence as identified by the participants, which is called the Frequency Index (F.I).

$$\text{Frequency Index (F. I.)}(\%) = \frac{\sum a(n/N)}{5} \times 100 \quad (1)$$

Where (a) is the constant expressing weighting given to each response (ranges from 1 for very small up to 5 for very high occurrence), n is the frequency of the responses, and N is the total number of responses. Similarly, a formula as shown in equation (2) used to rank risk factors based on severity index as indicated by the participants, which is called Severity Index (S.I).

$$\text{Severity Index (S. I.)}(\%) = \frac{\sum a(n/N)}{5} \times 100 \quad (2)$$

Where (a) is the constant expressing weighting given to each response (range from 1 for very low to 5 for very high effect), n is the frequency of the response, and N is the total number of responses. Importance Index: The importance index of each risk factor is calculated as a function of both frequency and severity indices, as follows:

$$\text{Importance Index (I.I.) (\%)} = \frac{\text{F.I. (\%)} \times \text{S.I. (\%)}}{100} \quad (3)$$

Table 2


INTERVIEW NO.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	Total	Mean(m)	SD(s)	C.O.V=(s/m)
Loss due to Fluctuation of interest rate	0.64	0.64	0.8	0.64	0.48	0.64	0.64	0.64	0.64	0.36	0.64	0.48	0.64	0.64	8.52	0.608	0	0
Low credibility of shareholder and lender	0.64	0.36	0.36	0.48	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.64	0.64	0.36	0.64	0.36	0.36	6.28	0.448	0.14	0.312
Change in bank formalities and lenders	0.36	0.24	0.36	0.48	0.64	0.36	0.36	0.64	0.36	0.36	0.24	0.48	0.48	0.16	5.52	0.394	0.1	0.253
Loss due to rise in fuel prices	0.64	0.48	0.48	0.36	0.48	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.24	0.24	0.16	0.04	3.92	0.28	0.3	1.071
Insurances risk	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.24	0.04	0.08	0.24	0.16	0.04	3.08	0.22	0.16	0.727
Default by subcontractors	0.36	0.48	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.08	0.16	0.08	0.32	0.04	0.08	0.16	0.16	0.16	2.8	0.2	0.1	0.5
Inadequate Cash Flow	0.64	0.64	0.64	0.48	0.64	0.24	0.36	0.36	0.48	0.24	0.64	0.64	0.36	0.36	6.72	0.48	0.14	0.291
Inflation, Availability of foreign currency & Exchange Rate change	0.36	0.64	0.48	0.36	0.48	0.08	0.16	0.36	0.24	0.24	0.36	0.64	0.36	0.36	5.12	0.365	0	0
Taxes and burdens	0.48	0.36	0.64	0.36	0.24	0.24	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.08	0.16	0.36	0.16	0.04	3.6	0.257	0.22	0.855
Inexperience when pricing tenders	0.48	0.24	0.48	0.36	0.24	0.24	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.08	0.04	0.24	0.16	0.16	3.2	0.228	0.16	0.7
Breach of contract by project partner	0.64	0.48	0.36	0.64	0.36	0.36	0.24	0.36	0.24	0.16	0.24	0.48	0.16	0.36	5.08	0.362	0.14	0.385
Lack of enforcement of legal judgment	0.64	0.64	0.36	0.48	0.48	0.36	0.24	0.16	0.24	0.24	0.16	0.48	0.16	0.16	4.8	0.342	0.24	0.7
Improper verification of contract document	0.36	0.36	0.24	0.36	0.36	0.16	0.24	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.48	0.16	0.04	3.4	0.242	0.16	0.658
Uncertainty and unfairness of court justice	0.36	0.64	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.24	0.24	0.16	0.24	0.16	0.16	4.12	0.294	0.1	0.3398
Change of top management	0.36	0.24	0.36	0.36	0.48	0.08	0.16	0.04	0.04	0.16	0.08	0.16	0.04	0.64	3.2	0.228	0.14	0.612
No past experience in similar project	0.64	0.48	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.08	0.16	0.04	0.16	0.08	0.16	0.36	0.16	0.36	3.76	0.268	0.14	0.521
Short tender time	0.36	0.48	0.16	0.24	0.24	0.08	0.16	0.16	0.04	0.08	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	2.64	0.188	0.1	0.530
Internal management problem	0.48	0.24	0.16	0.16	0.24	0.16	0.16	0.04	0.04	0.08	0.04	0.36	0.16	0.16	2.48	0.177	0.16	0.903
Improper project feasibility study	0.64	0.64	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.08	0.24	0.16	0.16	0.36	0.04	0.36	0.16	0.36	4.64	0.331	0.14	0.422
Poor relation and disputes with partner	0.36	0.24	0.36	0.36	0.24	0.24	0.08	0.04	0.04	0.16	0.04	0.16	0.04	0.16	2.52	0.18	0.1	0.555
Team work	0.36	0.48	0.64	0.48	0.48	0.24	0.08	0.08	0.16	0.36	0.16	0.36	0.16	0.16	4.2	0.3	0.1	0.3333
Time constraint	0.64	0.36	0.48	0.64	0.64	0.24	0.08	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.36	4.4	0.3142857	0.14	0.4454
Project delay	0.36	0.64	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.16	0.08	0.16	0.24	0.16	0.16	0.48	0.16	0.16	4.2	0.3	0.1	0.333
Competition from other similar projects	0.64	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.24	0.16	0.36	0.16	0.16	0.08	0.04	0.48	0.08	0.16	3.64	0.26	0.24	0.9230
Fall short of expected income from project	0.36	0.48	0.36	0.36	0.24	0.16	0.16	0.08	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.48	0.08	0.08	2.96	0.211	0.14	0.6621
Increase of resettlement costs	0.36	0.36	0.48	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.04	0.04	0.16	0.24	0.16	0.08	3.12	0.222	0.14	0.628
Increase of labour costs	0.48	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.24	0.04	0.08	2.88	0.205	0.2	0.972
Increase of materials price	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.24	0.48	0.24	0.08	0.24	0.08	0.08	0.04	0.24	0.16	0.08	3.04	0.217	0.14	0.644
Inadequate forecast about market demand	0.64	0.24	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.16	0.08	0.16	0.08	0.08	0.04	0.36	0.16	0.08	3.16	0.225	0.28	1.2405
Local protectionism	0.48	0.36	0.24	0.24	0.36	0.16	0.08	0.08	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.24	0.08	0.04	2.48	0.177	0.22	1.2419
Unfairness in tendering	0.36	0.24	0.36	0.16	0.24	0.16	0.08	0.16	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.24	0.08	0.04	2.24	0.16	0.16	1
Cost increase due to changes of Govt policies	0.48	0.48	0.24	0.36	0.36	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.64	0.16	0.08	3.76	0.268	0.2	0.744
Loss incurred due to political changes	0.24	0.36	0.48	0.24	0.36	0.08	0.16	0.16	0.04	0.16	0.16	0.48	0.08	0.16	3.16	0.225	0.04	0.177
Loss due to bureaucracy for late approvals	0.16	0.36	0.36	0.16	0.36	0.12	0.16	0.36	0.04	0.16	0.16	0.24	0.04	0.04	2.72	0.194	0.06	0.3088
War and Civil disorders	0.24	0.36	0.36	0.24	0.24	0.08	0.16	0.16	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.24	0.16	0.04	2.4	0.171	0.1	0.5833
Problems with Licenses	0.64	0.24	0.36	0.16	0.16	0.04	0.16	0.08	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.36	0.04	0.04	2.4	0.171	0.3	1.75
Accidents on site	0.48	0.36	0.24	0.48	0.64	0.16	0.16	0.08	0.16	0.04	0.08	0.16	0.16	0.04	3.24	0.231	0.22	0.950
Design changes	0.64	0.24	0.36	0.24	0.36	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.16	0.04	0.16	2.44	0.174	0.24	1.377
Equipment failure	0.48	0.24	0.24	0.36	0.36	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.36	0.04	0.04	2.36	0.168	0.22	1.3050
Errors in design drawings	0.36	0.36	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.16	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.16	0.16	0.04	2.16	0.1542857	0.16	1.037037037
High degree of difficulty in construction	0.24	0.64	0.36	0.24	0.48	0.08	4	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.36	0.16	0.04	6.76	0.4828571	0.1	0.207100592
Incompetence of transportation facilities	0.36	0.48	0.64	0.36	0.36	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.16	0.08	0.04	0.16	0.16	0.04	2.96	0.2114286	0.16	0.756756757
Industrial disputes	0.36	0.24	0.48	0.24	0.36	0.04	0.08	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.08	0.04	0.04	2.12	0.1514286	0.16	1.056603774
Materials shortage	0.24	0.48	0.24	0.16	0.48	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.08	0.04	0.04	2	0.1428571	0.1	0.7
Obsolescence of building equipment	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.36	0.48	0.16	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.16	0.08	0.08	0.04	0.16	3.2	0.2285714	0.16	0.7
poor quality of procured materials	0.24	0.48	0.48	0.36	0.48	0.04	0.04	0.16	0.04	0.16	0.16	0.08	0.04	0.04	2.8	0.2	0.1	0.5
Unknown site physical conditions	0.24	0.36	0.36	0.16	0.36	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.08	0.16	0.04	0.16	2.12	0.1514286	0.04	0.264150943
Following government standards and codes	0.36	0.36	0.24	0.16	0.16	0.08	0.04	0.16	0.04	0.04	0.16	0.04	0.16	0.04	2.04	0.1457143	0.16	1.098039216
Wastage of materials by workers	0.36	0.24	0.16	0.24	0.24	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.08	0.08	0.04	0.16	1.8	0.1285714	0.1	0.777777778
Site distance from urban area	0.36	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.48	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.08	0.04	0.04	0.08	0.04	0.04	2	0.1428571	0.16	1.12
Surplus materials handling	0.16	0.36	0.16	0.36	0.48	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	1.88	0.1342857	0.06	0.446808511
Architect Vs Structural Engineer dispute	0.36	0.16	0.16	0.36	0.16	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.16	0.04	0.04	1.68	0.12	0.16	1.333333333
Shortage of skillful workers	0.24	0.48	0.48	0.24	0.48	0.08	0.16	0.16	0.24	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	3.36	0.24	0.04	0.166666667
Insufficient Detailing	0.36	0.16	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.16	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.08	0.16	0.16	0.16	2.48	0.1771429	0.1	0.564516129
Any adverse impact on project due to climatic conditions	0.36	0.48	0.36	0.36	0.24	0.36	0.16	0.24	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.36	0.16	0.16	3.72	0.2657143	0.1	0.376344086
Any impact on the environment due to the project	0.36	0.24	0.36	0.24	0.48	0.24	0.16	0.24	0.16	0.04	0.08	0.16	0.16	0.04	2.96	0.2114286	0.16	0.756756757
Earthquake	0.24	0.36	0.32	0.36	0.36	0.24	0.16	0.16	0.04	0.08	0.08	0.16	0.04	0.16	2.76	0.1971429	0.04	0.202898551
Fire	0.36	0.24	0.32	0.24	0.48	0.16	0.16	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.16	0.04	0.04	2.52	0.18	0.16	0.888888889
Collapse and Land Slide	0.36	0.36	0.32	0.64	0.36	0.16	0.36	0.16	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.24	0.04	0.16	3.4	0.2428571	0.1	0.411764706
Incliment Weather	0.24	0.48	0.48	0.36	0.36	0.16	0.08	0.16	0.08	0.16	0.04	0.16	0.04	0.04	2.84	0.2028571	0.1	0.492957746
Floods	0.48	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.16	0.08	0.08	0.04	0.08	0.04	0.48	0.04	0.04	2.96	0.2114286	0.22	1.040540541
Resettlement and rehabilitation of people	0.36	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.32	0.16	0.24	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.36	0.48	0.64	0.64	5.72	0.4085714	0.14	0.342657343
Problems due to adjacent or nearby projects	0.36	0.48	0.48	0.36	0.24	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.36	0.36	0.48	0.36	0.36	4.48	0.32	0	0
Local people support for the project	0.36	0.36	0.24	0.16	0.36	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.36	0.64	0.16	0.48	0.16	0.16	3.92	0.28	0.1	0.357142857

TABLE 3


Ranking of Risk			
S.No	Risks	Index Score	Rank order
1	Loss due to Fluctuation of interest rate	0.608	1
2	High degree of difficulty in construction	0.482	2
3	Inadequate Cash Flow	0.48	3
4	Low credibility of shareholder and lender	0.448	4
5	Resettlement and rehabilitation of people	0.408	5
6	Change in bank formalities and lenders	0.394	6
7	Inflation, Availability of foreign currency & Exchange Rate change	0.365	7
8	Breach of contract by project partner	0.362	8
9	Lack of enforcement of legal judgment	0.342	9
10	Improper project feasibility study	0.331	10
11	Problems due to adjacent or nearby projects	0.32	11
12	Time constraint	0.314	12
13	Team work	0.3	13
14	Project delay	0.3	14
15	Uncertainty and unfairness of court justice	0.294	15
16	Loss due to rise in fuel prices	0.28	16
17	Loss due to rise in fuel prices	0.28	17
18	Local people support for the project	0.28	18
19	Any adverse impact on project due to climatic conditions	0.265	19
20	Cost increase due to changes of Govt policies	0.268	20
21	Competition from other similar projects	0.26	21
22	Competition from other similar projects	0.26	22
23	No past experience in similar project	0.268	23
24	Any adverse impact on project due to climatic conditions	0.265	24
25	Taxes and burdens	0.257	25
26	Collapse and Land Slide	0.2428	26
27	Accidents on site	0.231	27
28	Improper verification of contract document	0.242	28
29	Shortage of skillful workers	0.24	29
30	Insurances risk	0.22	30
31	Inexperience when pricing tenders	0.228	31
32	Change of top management	0.228	32
33	Increase of resettlement costs	0.222	33
34	Inadequate forecast about market demand	0.225	34
35	Loss incurred due to political changes	0.225	35
36	Obsolescence of building equipment	0.228	36
37	Increase of materials price	0.217	37
38	Floods	0.211	38
39	Any impact on the environment due to the project	0.211	39
40	Incompetence of transportation facilities	0.211	40
41	Fall short of expected income from project	0.211	41
42	Inclement Weather	0.202	42
43	poor quality of procured materials	0.2	43

44	Increase of labour costs	0.205	44
45	Earthquake	0.197	45
46	Loss due to bureaucracy for late approvals	0.194	46
47	Short tender time	0.188	47
48	Poor relation and disputes with partner	0.18	48
49	Fire	0.18	49
50	Insufficient Detailing	0.177	50
51	Internal management problem	0.177	51
52	Local protectionism	0.177	52
53	Design changes	0.174	53
54	War and Civil disorders	0.171	54
55	Problems with Licenses	0.171	55
56	Unfairness in tendering	0.16	56
57	Equipment failure	0.168	57
58	Errors in design drawings	0.154	58
59	Industrial disputes	0.151	59
60	Unknown site physical conditions	0.151	60
61	Following government standards and codes	0.145	61
62	Materials shortage	0.142	62
63	Site distance from urban area	0.142	63
64	Surplus materials handling	0.134	64
65	Wastage of materials by workers	0.128	65
66	Architect Vs Structural Engineer dispute	0.12	66


Ranking of Risk




FINANCIAL RISKS	Index Score(□)
Loss due to Fluctuation of interest rate	0.608
Inadequate Cash Flow	0.48
Low credibility of shareholder and lender	0.448
Change in bank formalities and lenders	0.394
Inflation, Availability of foreign currency & Exchange Rate change	0.365
Loss due to rise in fuel prices	0.28
Taxes and burdens	0.257
Insurances risk	0.22
Inexperience when pricing tenders	0.228




LEGAL RISKS	Index Score(□)
Breach of contract by project partner	0.362
Lack of enforcement of legal judgment	0.342
Uncertainty and unfairness of court justice	0.294
Improper verification of contract document	0.242




Management Risk	Index Score(□)
Improper project feasibility study	0.331
Time constraint	0.314
Team work	0.3
Project delay	0.3
No past experience in similar project	0.268
Change of top management	0.228
Poor relation and disputes with partner	0.18
Short tender time	0.188
Internal management problem	0.177




Market Risk	Index Score(□)
Competition from other similar projects	0.26
Inadequate forecast about market demand	0.225
Increase of resettlement costs	0.222
Fall short of expected income from project	0.211
Increase of materials price	0.217
Increase of labour costs	0.205
Local protectionism	0.177




Political Risk	Index Score(□)
Cost increase due to changes of Govt policies	0.268
Loss incurred due to political changes	0.225
Loss due to bureaucracy for late approvals	0.194
War and Civil disorders	0.171
Problems with Licenses	0.171




Technical Risk	Index Score(□)
High degree of difficulty in construction	0.482
Shortage of skillful workers	0.24
Accidents on site	0.231
Obsolescence of building equipment	0.228
Incompetence of transportation facilities	0.211
poor quality of procured materials	0.2
Design changes	0.174
Equipment failure	0.168
Errors in design drawings	0.154
Unknown site physical conditions	0.151
Industrial disputes	0.151
Following government standards and codes	0.145
Materials shortage	0.142
Site distance from urban area	0.142
Surplus materials handling	0.134
Wastage of materials by workers	0.128
Architect Vs Structural Engineer dispute	0.12



Environmental Risk & Natural Risk	Index Score(□)
Any adverse impact on project due to climatic conditions	0.265
Any impact on the environment due to the project	0.211
Earthquake	0.197
Fire	0.18
Collapse and Land Slide	0.2428
Inclement Weather	0.202
Floods	0.211



Social Risk	Index Score(□)
Resettlement and rehabilitation of people	0.408
Problems due to adjacent or nearby projects	0.32
Local people support for the project	0.28



VI. CONCLUSION

In this study, identifying the risk factors faced by the construction industry is based on collecting information about construction risks, their consequences and corrective actions that may be done to prevent or mitigate the risk effects. The main point which was considered this research is to explore the key risk factors and identify these factors that could be faced in construction projects in India.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alfrdel Cano, and M. Pilar de la Cruz, (2002) "Integrated Methodology for Project Risk Management", journal of Construction Engineering and Management, ASCE, PP.473-485
- [2] Amiruddin Ismail, abbas M. Abd et.al (2007) "Modeling of Risk Assessment for Integrated Project Management System in Construction" APRN journal of Engineering and applied Science, Vol.2, No.6, pp. 37-43
- [3] Ahmed A. Kayis B, Amornsawadwatana S. (2007) A review of techniques for risk management in projects. Vol NO 14, No.1, pp. 22–36.
- [4] Australian / New Zealand Standard Risk Management (AS /N/ZS 4360 : 2004)
- [5] Bing, L.,Tiong , R. L. K., Wong, W. F., and Chow, D,(1999) "Risk management in international construction joint ventures." Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, ASCE, Vol.125 No.4, pp.277–284
- [6] B.Mulholland and J.Christian (1999) "Risk assessment in construction schedules" Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, Vol. 125, No.1, pp. 8-15
- [7] Daud Nasir, Brenda McCabe and Loesie Hartono (2003) "Evaluating Risk in Construction–Schedule Model (ERIC–S) Construction Schedule Risk Model" Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, ASCE, Vol. 129, No. 5, pp.518-527
- [8] Dariusz Skorupka (2008) "Identification and Initial Risk Assessment of Construction Projects in Poland" Journal of Management, ASCE, Vol. 24, No.3, pp. 120-127
- [9] Darius Migilinskas ,Leonas Ustinovicus(2008) " Methodology of risk and uncertainty Management in Construction's Technological and Economical Problems ISRC
- [10] Gregory Carter and Simon D.Smith (2006) "Safety Hazard Identification on Construction Project" Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, ASCE,Vol.132, No.2,pp. 197-205
- [11] Hyun-Ho Choi Hyo-Nam Cho and J. W. Seo (2004) "Risk Assessment Methodology for Underground Construction Projects" Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, ASCE, pp.258-272
- [12] Hong-bo Zhou, S.e. M.ASCE and Hui Zhang,(2011) "Risk Assessment Methodology for a deep Foundation Pit Construction Project in Shanghai, China" Journal of Construction Engineering and management, ASCE, pp. 1185-1194
- [13] Hariharan Subramanyan, Priyadarshi H. Sawant,andVandana Bhatt (2012) " Construction Project risk Assessment: Development of Model Based on Investigation of opinion of Construction Project Experts from India" Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, ASCE, Vol.138 , pp. 409 -421
- [14] Jamal F. Al-Bahar et.al (1990) "Systematic Risk Management Approach for Construction Projects" Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, ASCE, Vol. 116, No.3,pp. 533-546
- [15] Li Bing and Robert L. K. Tiong,(1999) "Risk management model for international construction joint ventures" Journal of Construction Engineering and Management, ASCE, Vol. 125, No.5,pp. 377-384.



10.22214/IJRASET



45.98



IMPACT FACTOR:
7.129



IMPACT FACTOR:
7.429



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH

IN APPLIED SCIENCE & ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

Call : 08813907089  (24*7 Support on Whatsapp)